UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,123	01/09/2004	James R. Bailey	2003-0270.02	8456

21972   7590   08/13/2008
LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD
BLDG. 082-1
LEXINGTON, KY 40550-0999

EXAMINER
TSAI, TSUNO YIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

DETAIL ACTION

Acknowledge of **After Final** received on 7/28/2008 and made of record.

Acknowledge of amendment to claims 1 and 14.

Acknowledge of canceling claims 7-8 and 20-21.

Response to Arguments

11)

Applicant's argument – Page 7-8 regarding claims 1 and 14 citing border determination by ignoring the section of the image scanning area having defect.

Examiner's response – Examiner notice that claim 8 was cancel but was amended into claim 1. Note that this was done the same with canceling claim 21 and amending onto claim 14. However, claims 8 and 21 were rejected already in the Office Action before. Such that amending the claims this way does not further assist the applicant in narrowing down the novelty of their invention.

Paragraph 0031 and figures 1 and 2 discloses the process where area is not ignore but rather cut out and further auto-fit. Auto-fitting in the way where the target region is fit to a full page again. Thus, it is unclear in the claim language as what is consider "ignore". Where ignore can be seen as still processing the area where the defect is but where the area is white out as taught by prior arts.

      Examiner suggests more detail regarding the function and clarification of "ignoring".

Applicant's argument – Page 8 regarding claim 10.

Examiner's response – Since claim 10 dependent on claim 8 and claim 8 is cancel, the argument is moot.

Applicant's argument – Page 8-9 regarding claims 23 and 36 cited replicating the target image region over the image area.

Examiner's response – Peairs teaching where the retouch documents of the multiple hardcopies teaches the cited limitations. Retouch is seen where the target image region is apply to the resulting output of the image processing and process of the defect area.

      Examiner suggests that more detail regarding how the target image area is apply or reproduce. Is only that region of the target image area outputted? What if there are information out side the target image area that are near the defect area? Will that information be cut off? If so there will no full scan and output of the document as a whole during scanning.

      More details will disclose the novelty of the applicant's invention and might overcome the prior arts.